




Docket No.: 244490US6

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/694,042

Applicants: Hiroki NAITO, et al.

Filing Date: October 28, 2003

For: CRYSTALLINE SUPERFINE PARTICLES,
COMPLEX MATERIAL, METHOD OF
MANUFACTURING CRYSTALLINE SUPERFINE
PARTICLES, INVERTED MICELLES, INVERTED
MICELLES ENVELOPING PRECURSOR
SUPERFINE PARTICLES, INVERTED MICELLES
ENVELOPING CRYSTALLINE SUPERFINE
PARTICLES, AND PRECURSOR SUPERFINE
PARTICLES

Group Art Unit: 1773

Examiner: LE, H.T.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

We have not included a check as we do not believe any fee is required. In the event there are any Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.


Respectfully submitted,

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Bradley D. Lytle

Registration No. 40,073

DOCKET NO: 244490US6



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
HIROKI NAITO, ET AL. : EXAMINER: LE, H.T.
SERIAL NO: 10/694,042 :
FILED: OCTOBER 28, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1773
FOR: CRYSTALLINE SUPERFINE :
PARTICLES, COMPLEX MATERIAL,
METHOD OF MANUFACTURING
CRYSTALLINE SUPERFINE PARTICLES,
INVERTED MICELLES, INVERTED
MICELLES ENVELOPING PRECURSOR
SUPERFINE PARTICLES, INVERTED
MICELLES ENVELOPING
CRYSTALLINE SUPERFINE PARTICLES,
AND PRECURSOR SUPERFINE
PARTICLES

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement stated in the Official Action dated April 18, 2005, Applicants in the above-identified patent application provisionally elect Group I, Claims 1-15, drawn to crystalline particles.

The Restriction Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to distinct inventions. However, MPEP §803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be of an overlapping search area.


Application No. 10/694,042
Reply to Office Action of April 18, 2005

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully **traverse** the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

However, if the present Restriction Requirement is not withdrawn, examination on the merits of the Claims of Group I is believed to be in order, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

DOCUMENT4